

42390P16989

Remarks

Reconsideration of this application is requested. By this response to the Office Action dated April 5, 2005, claims 1-3 and 17-19 were amended. A listing of these claims and the actions taken is included in this amendment. Claims 1-3 and 17-19 remain in the application.

Response to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,650,694).

Claims 1-3

Applicant's amended claim 1 recites, among other things, operating the first and second datapaths in parallel to demodulate the received modulated data of multiple users.

Support for the amended language of Applicant's claims 1-3 can be found in FIG. 2 that shows the multiple reconfigurable datapaths coupled to an input antenna 52, where each datapath has a separate controller. Further support may be found in the specification at least on page 9, lines 5-17.

Brown et al. teach in FIG. 1 a correlator co-processor 100 having a configurable data path 300 that performs various functions based on a configuration supplied from configuration tables 160. The correlator co-processor 100 performs correlations and accumulations to handle all RAKE and searcher operations. Brown teaches in column 6, lines 35-64, that the correlator co-processor 100 is a multi-tasking machine that can handle 7 tasks. These tasks include (1) a finger task, (2) a delay profile estimation task, (3) a primary search code search task, (4) a secondary search code search, (5) a long code identifier search task, (6) a paging indication channel de-spreading task, and (7) an access search.

Brown et al. teach in column 9, lines 49-61, that buffered chip-rate samples from an analog front-end are used in correlation functions. The controller 150 is responsible for implementing each of the tasks performed by correlator co-processor

42390P16989

100. The configuration tables 160 specify how correlator co-processor 100 executes each of its tasks. In column 11, lines 54-62, examples are provided to show that configuration tables 160 may store the position and size of the pilot symbols for each spreading factor, or the Walsh codes associated with a particular finger task.

Whereas Applicant's claim 1 recites operating the first and second datapaths in parallel to demodulate the received modulated data of multiple users, Brown et al. neither illustrate in the figures nor teach in the specification that first and second configurable datapaths may operate in parallel. Accordingly the relied upon reference of Brown et al. cannot anticipate Applicant's amended claim 1 and it is believed that the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection has been overcome and should be removed.

The dependent claims 2 and 3 are believed allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as Applicant's base claim.

Claims 17-19

Applicant's amended claim 17 recites, among other things, first and second datapaths. A first controller selects a protocol and configures the first datapath to accept modulated data from the antenna and provide demodulated data in accordance with the protocol. A second controller configure the second datapath to operate in parallel with the first datapath.

In contrast to Browns' correlator co-processor 100 having only one configurable data path 300, Applicant's claim 17 includes first and second datapaths. As claimed, Applicant's multiple controllers and datapaths allow the datapaths to operate in parallel and process data as received from multiple users. Since Brown et al. do not teach this claimed feature, the relied upon art cannot anticipate Applicant's claim 17.

Applicant's claims 18 and 19 depend from base claim 17 and are believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as Applicant's claim 17.

42390P16989


Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed April 5, 2005, and reconsideration of the rejections is requested. It is submitted that claims 1-3 and 17-19 are now in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Applicants herewith petition the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to extend the time for response to the Office Action dated April 5, 2005, for 1 month. Please charge Deposit Account #50-0221 in the amount of \$120.00 for a one month extension. Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #50-0221.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informality issues that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (480) 715-5388 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Craig B. Greenberg


Lanny L. Parker
Patent Agent
Reg. No. 44,281

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd., Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 264-0967